

SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF AND PROJECTIONS FOR
VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE IN KANSAS AREA
VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL SCHOOLS 159

by

ALFRED J. MANNEBACH

B. S., Kansas State University, 1963

A MASTER'S REPORT

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Agricultural Education

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1965

Approved by:


Major Professor

LD
2668
R4
1965
M282
cop. 2

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express his gratitude and appreciation to his major instructor, Dr. R. J. Agan, Head of Agricultural Education at Kansas State University, who served as advisor in the preparation of this report.

Appreciation is also due to John Lacey, C. C. Eustace, John Cragun, Sam Stenzel, and Merwin Stearns for their suggestions in formulating the interview checklist questionnaire and to directors and vocational agriculture instructors in KAVTS who gave their time and cooperation in making this study possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	10
LIMITATIONS	11
DEFINITION OF TERMS	11
PROCEDURES	14
THE SCHOOLS IN THE STUDY	15
REVIEW OF LITERATURE	19
PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	22
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	84
IMPLICATIONS	89
BIBLIOGRAPHY	94
APPENDIXES	97
Appendix A	98
Appendix B	100
Appendix C	113

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Students of Vocational Agriculture Enrolled	
in KAVTS	25
II. Courses Included in the High School Vocational	
Agriculture Curriculum in KAVTS	27
III. Courses Included in the Post-High School and Adult	
Vocational Agriculture Curriculum in KAVTS . . .	29
IV. Division of Teaching Load in Multiple Teacher	
Departments	32
V. Facilities for Vocational Agriculture in KAVTS . .	34
VI. Time Spent Teaching Technical Agriculture in	
KAVTS	35
VII. Primary Way of Teaching Off-Farm Agricultural	
Occupations in KAVTS	37
VIII. Specific and Clusters of Off-Farm Agricultural	
Occupations Taught About	38
IX. Importance of Supervised Practice or On-Farm	
Instruction	41
X. Number of Supervised Practices or On-Farm	
Instruction Given per Student per Year	42
XI. Times per Year Class Field Trips Were Taken	
to Farms to Study Production Methods,	
Approved Practices and Learn Skills	43

TABLE	PAGE
XII. Opinions About Needs and Capability of Teaching Post-High School Courses	49
XIII. Projections of What Would be the Main Purposes of Vocational Agriculture in KAVTS	51
XIV. Opinions of Changes Which Must be Made in Vocational Agriculture to Meet the Basic Intent and Concept of KAVTS	53
XV. Opinions of What New Areas Would Become a Part of the Post-High School Vocational Agriculture Curriculum	56
XVI. Responses of How Courses or Areas Taught Would be Determined	58
XVII. Provision for Training Academically Handicapped Students	60
XVIII. Projected Level of Cooperative Training in KAVTS .	61
XIX. Areas Which Would Best Fit the Vocational Agriculture Cooperative Training Program	63
XX. Advantages of the Vocational Agriculture Program Being a Part of KAVTS	66
XXI. Disadvantages of the Vocational Agriculture Program Being a Part of KAVTS	68

TABLE

PAGE

XXII.	Projections of Where Post-High School Students Completing Vocational Agriculture Training in KAVTS Would be Placed	71
XXIII.	Opinions of Where Qualified Instructors for Specialized Areas Would be Obtained	73
XXIV.	Projected Number of Teachers in KAVTS Three Years From Now	75
XXV.	Projection of the Need for a Full Time Vocational Agriculture Instructor to Teach Young Farmers, Adult Farmers and Farm Business Analysis Classes	76
XXVI.	Areas in Which Agricultural Education Would be Provided for Young and Adult Farmers	78
XXVII.	Projected Enrollment in Vocational Agriculture in KAVTS three Years From Now	79
XXVIII.	School, Student and Community Reaction to Vocational Agriculture in KAVTS	81
XXIX.	Responses of How FFA Would be Affected in KAVTS .	82

INTRODUCTION

Vocational agriculture was introduced to the high schools of the United States and provided by law in 1917 under provisions of the Smith-Hughes Act.

The vocational agriculture program was increasingly accepted by secondary school administrators and is widely accepted today as constituting an appropriate and essential segment of the secondary school offerings. Vocational agriculture enrollment increased from 467,495 in 1961 to 488,624 in 1963.¹

It was evident to those who were engaged in vocational agriculture work that there was a continuing and perhaps ever increasing need to revise and reconstruct the vocational agriculture program in order to meet the needs of a changing agriculture.

This fact was brought out in the 1962 findings of the Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education. The Panel stated, "It is especially important that the 26 million young workers

¹"Summary of Offerings and Enrollments in High School Subjects, 1960-64," Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, (Washington: Government Printing Office).

who will start work in this decade have aptitudes, skills, and education that match the needs of our changing economy."²

The Panel further indicated that the public program of vocational and technical education is probably the major program preparing these youth for employment.³

The Panel stated that it was convinced that vocational and technical education were sound investments in people. In their opinion ample data indicated that graduates of high school vocational education programs were far less likely to be unemployed than other high school graduates; that vocational education graduates did in fact work in the occupations for which they were prepared and that vocational education increased subsequent earnings.⁴

However, the Panel found that vocational education was not available to enough high school students. Less than half of the public secondary schools offered courses in homemaking or vocational agriculture.⁵

²Fact Sheets on Report of Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education, Fact Sheet No. 2, Summary of Panel's Findings, (presented to the U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, Washington D. C., 1963), p. 1.

³Ibid., p. 2.

⁴Ibid., p. 3.

⁵Ibid., p. 4.

The Panel also found that vocational education programs were not preparing people for enough kinds of jobs. One study which compared vocational education enrollments with subsequent occupational distribution found that ten boys studied vocational agriculture for every one hundred males subsequently employed in that field.⁶

Post-high school technical training was an especially critical need, the Panel found.⁷

In addition to these findings, the Panel stated in the summary of its recommendations that, "The vocational agriculture program, under federal reimbursement, should permit instruction for related agricultural occupations as well as for farming."⁸

Aware of these facts on a national level, the Kansas Governor's Economic Development Committee recommended that Kansas must develop a more adequate vocational program to train

⁶Ibid., p. 5.

⁷Ibid.

⁸Fact Sheets of Report of Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education, Fact Sheet No. 3, Summary of Panel's Recommendations, (presented to the U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Washington D. C., 1963), p. 3.

its citizens who have been displaced or who need additional training to qualify for job opportunities in the state.⁹

The rapidly changing farm employment situation indicated to the Governor's committee that four out of every five young people who grow up on the farm must look to our cities for employment. It was also found by this committee that in addition to the opportunities for a college education, Kansas needed a supplemental program in vocational and technical training which would be broader based.

The committee stated that adequate opportunity should, therefore, be made available to those who do not go to college, and those who do not graduate from college, to learn a trade or skill which would assist them in obtaining jobs.¹⁰

To accomplish the goal of quality vocational education, the committee suggested that broad, general principles be considered:

1. Education in trade and industry should be supplementary to and not a substitute for regular curricula in our public schools. It should be complementary to instruction in the basic fields of learning.

⁹Economic Development for Kansas, . . . An Action Program, Vocational Education Section, Recommendations of Governor's Economic Development Committee, 1962, p. 1.

¹⁰Ibid.

2. The primary objective of such a program should be to enlarge the potential of the individual through knowledge and skill useful to himself, his employer, and society in general.

3. The program must be responsive to qualitative standards that will serve as an incentive to the student and the degree or certificate given should specify the student's achievement.

4. The program should be designed to fit the specific needs of the people of the state in specified areas of training, and should be predicated on the ability and desire of the people to support it.

5. The program should be made available where the greatest need exists, and at such hours, days, and places that the greatest number of students can participate at the lowest cost per student.¹¹

The committee further stated that a co-ordinated state system of vocational education was necessary to assure:

1. That the manpower supply for industry, business, and the professions be more nearly adequate.

2. That the offerings of vocational education be as broad as the needs of the labor force.

3. That unnecessary duplication of vocational training be avoided by controlling the courses offered in a geographic area by more than one school.

4. That when the individual is employed at his full potential a contribution to the state's economy will be made.¹²

¹¹Ibid., p. 2.

¹²Ibid., pp. 2-3.

The committee also suggested that the proposed area vocational schools would provide for development of a state-wide program in the interest of efficiency and economy since every school district did not have the need and could not afford an extensive vocational education program. It was possible that several school districts or several counties could be included in one area school as the mobility of people is far greater now than when vocational education was first conceived. It was conceived that the area should be large enough so that it might have sufficient sources of revenue to support it and so that the optimum number of students might attend it.¹³

It was recognized that these recommendations held tremendous impact on the growth and economy of Kansas. The legislature of the State of Kansas enacted Senate Bill No. 438, an act providing area vocational-technical schools to be in force from and after July 1, 1963.

In its declaration of purpose the legislature stated that it was the intention of the legislature and the purpose of this act to provide a means whereby the state of Kansas in co-operation with local communities could provide facilities for training

¹³Ibid., p. 3.

and preparation of students for productive employment as technicians and skilled workers, and to more nearly equalize educational opportunity.¹⁴

In carrying out this purpose, from July 1, 1963, to July 1, 1964, the State Board for Vocational Education approved the operation of area vocational-technical schools at eight centers. These were located at Goodland in northwest Kansas; Beloit in northcentral Kansas; Salina in central Kansas; Topeka in northeast Kansas; Dodge City in southwest Kansas; Emporia in eastcentral Kansas; multi-centered units at Hutchinson, Newton, and McPherson in southcentral Kansas; and in southeast Kansas at Coffeyville, with auxiliary centers at Columbus, Elk City, Howard, and Caney.

Programs in vocational agriculture or related agricultural occupations were made available in each of the approved schools except Salina and Hutchinson.¹⁵

"We want to emphasize these schools are designed to train people to meet the needs of the labor force of Kansas, whether it

¹⁴Senate Bill No. 438. Legislature of the State of Kansas. Enacted July 1, 1963.

¹⁵Thaine D. McCormick, "Learning That Makes Careers," The Kansas Farmer-Stockman, LXVIII (February, 1965), 12.

be in agriculture, industry, or the service occupations," said Thaine D. McCormick, Topeka, State Director of Vocational Education. "With their farm background and knowledge of farm equipment operation, farm boys are particularly good students in agricultural occupations such as farm machinery repair, farm tractor mechanics, and heavy equipment operation".¹⁶

He further stated that this new development in vocational education was promising to be of great interest and help to high school students, post-high school folks, the so-called dropouts, even adults.¹⁷

From the foregoing background development in vocational education, it was believed by the writer that it was a fact to be readily recognized that revision and updating vocational education had been receiving much needed attention on the national, state, and local levels. Surveys have been made, facts have been reported, recommendations have been presented, laws have been enacted and Kansas has implemented a state wide system of area vocational-technical schools for the expressed purpose of equalizing the educational opportunity for all Kansas youth.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 60.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 12.

The problems which presented themselves in the opinion of the writer were: (1) what are the characteristics of vocational agriculture in these schools; (2) what changes have been made; (3) and what does the future hold?

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The central purpose of this study was to determine selected characteristics of and projections for vocational agriculture in Kansas Area Vocational-Technical Schools.

Additional purposes were: (1) to provide a review of selected characteristics of vocational agriculture departments as they were operating in Kansas Area Vocational-Technical Schools; (2) to find what vocational agriculture instructors and directors were projecting for vocational agriculture in Kansas Area Vocational-Technical Schools in the future; (3) to determine to what extent vocational agriculture in Kansas Area Vocational-Technical Schools was serving students on a area basis and what projections were being made for this service; (4) to obtain opinions concerning what areas must be trained for; (5) to find what teachers and directors thought would be a feasible and workable program to meet area needs; and (6) to compile selected basic information which could be used as guidelines in the future establishment and maintenance of vocational agriculture in other Kansas Area Vocational-Technical Schools.

LIMITATIONS

The study was limited to interviewing the directors, assistant directors, and vocational agriculture teachers of Kansas Area Vocational-Technical Schools which had a vocational agriculture program in operation.

The interview method of collecting data was used. Many of the questions left the interviewee much freedom of response. Opinions as well as facts were reported. These responses were analyzed and grouped into common characteristics for presentation.

Statistical measures were limited to the computation of numbers, per cents, ranges, and the mean as a measure of central tendency.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

For the purpose of this study several terms were identified and defined which had special significance. The definitions were made for the purpose of this study only.

Area Vocational Technical School. Those vocational or technical schools organized and approved by the state board and

officially designated as area vocational-technical schools under the provisions of this act.¹

State Board. The Kansas State Board for Vocational Education.

Cooperative Program. An organized plan of on-the-job training which combines in-school education with supervised employment in establishments of local employers so as to insure realistic and up-to-date training.

Farm Boy. Any boy enrolled in a high school vocational agriculture course who according to the teacher of vocational agriculture lived on a farm.

Non-Farm Boy. Any boy enrolled in a high school vocational agriculture course who according to the teacher of vocational agriculture lived in town.

Multiple Teacher Department. A department of vocational agriculture in which more than one teacher was employed.

¹Kansas Senate Bill No. 438. Legislature of the State of Kansas. Enacted July 1, 1963.

Post High School Student. High school dropouts, high school graduates, or adults who were attending day classes of vocational agriculture for the purpose of acquiring knowledge and skill for gainful employment.

Young Farmers. Students attending night classes of vocational agriculture, usually under 35 years of age, who were becoming established in farming.

Adult Farmers. Students established in farming who were attending night classes of vocational agriculture for the purpose of becoming more proficient and upgrading their knowledge and skills.

Farm Business Analysis Program. An organized program of record book instruction and enterprise analysis designed to improve the efficiency of those established or becoming established in farming.

Advisory Council. A group of citizens appointed by the board of education for the expressed purpose of advising the program of vocational education in agriculture . . . advisory to the teacher, the administration, and to the board of education.

PROCEDURES

A list of directors and vocational agriculture teachers of the area vocational-technical schools was obtained from the 1964-65 Directory of the Kansas State Board for Vocational Education.

Directors of the schools were sent letters asking for appointments for interviews. The directors and vocational agriculture instructors were interviewed and data collected by use of an interview checklist-questionnaire.

In formulating the interview checklist-questionnaire used in this study, the author attempted to ask questions most often mentioned as important when discussing the problem with a selected informal panel of consultants.

Members of this selected informal panel included vocational agriculture instructors John Cragun of Ellinwood, Kansas, Sam Stenzel of Russell, Kansas, and Merwin Stearns of Manhattan, Kansas. Other members included Dr. R. J. Agan, Head Teacher Trainer of Vocational Agriculture at Kansas State University; C. C. Eustace, State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture in Kansas; and John Lacey, State Director of Kansas Area Vocational-Technical Schools.

THE SCHOOLS IN THE STUDY

The study covered twelve centers in seven area vocational-technical schools throughout the state of Kansas. Each area vocational-technical school was unique with respect to such characteristics as type of farming area, courses stressed, number of teachers, and number of centers.

Because of this variation of vocational agriculture, a description of each Kansas Area Vocational-Technical School was compiled using information acquired from general knowledge of the author as life-long resident of Kansas, information acquired by the author in a Kansas Geography course taken at Kansas State University (Geography of Kansas), and general information acquired during the study.

Northwest Kansas Area Vocational-Technical School,
Goodland, Kansas. Located in northwest Kansas, the area was considered to be a wheat and ranch farming area. Farm mechanics and tractor engine overhaul were specialized areas in vocational agriculture. It was the only Kansas Area Vocational-Technical School that enrolled day school post high school students in the vocational agriculture curriculum. One full-

time vocational agriculture instructor and one full-time farm mechanics instructor also instructed adult farmer classes. An entirely new structure housed the school. The area had a strong farm management association.

Southwest Kansas Area Vocational-Technical School, Dodge City, Kansas. Located in southwest Kansas, the area was increasing in irrigation, specialty crops and large cattle feedlots. No post-high school or adult classes were offered. No changes had been made in the vocational agriculture program and no new facilities had been added.

North Central Kansas Area Vocational-Technical School, Beloit, Kansas. The school was located in a wheat, ranch, and diversified farming area. One full-time and one part-time vocational agriculture teachers were employed. Adult classes were offered. New facilities were planned. A large consumer and grain cooperative was in operation in the area.

Flint Hills Area Vocational-Technical School, Emporia, Kansas. Located in the Flint Hills, livestock and diversified farming were dominant. A progressive Young Farmer organization was in operation. New facilities were under construction.

Northeast Kansas Area Vocational-Technical School, Topeka, Kansas. Located in northeast Kansas, the area was considered to be a diversified farming and ranching area. This vocational agriculture program was presently serving non-farm boys. A cooperative training program was in effect in vocational agriculture, the only one in Kansas Area Vocational-Technical Schools. The director and assistant director were interviewed in addition to the vocational agriculture instructor. No adults or post-high school courses were offered in vocational agriculture.

Central Kansas Area Vocational-Technical School; centers at Hutchinson, Newton, and McPherson, Kansas. This area was located in a diversified farming area with wheat dominant. Newton and McPherson had vocational agriculture programs in operation. In addition to the director of the Central Kansas Area Vocational-Technical School, each center had an associate director. At McPherson the associate director was the vocational agriculture instructor. At Newton an extensive Farm Business Analysis program was in operation. Young and Adult Farmer programs were also offered.

Southeast Kansas Area Vocational-Technical School; centers at Coffeyville, Columbus, Caney, Elk City, and Howard. This area

was characterized by diversified farming with ranching dominant in the southern Flint Hills area. Part-time farming was also characteristic of the area. The director at Coffeyville, the assistant director at Columbus, and vocational agriculture teachers at all centers were interviewed. Young Farmer and Farm Business Analysis programs were in operation at Columbus. No new facilities had been constructed.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

A search was made of studies in Vocational Education in an effort to locate previous studies of this type. Several studies were found which related in general but none were found which were specifically a study of characteristics of and projections for area vocational-technical schools in Kansas. No attempt was made to review all studies generally related to the area. The following were selected for review.

Agan, in study of non-farm agricultural occupations in Kansas, found the need would continue to be large for employees in agricultural firms studied. The 495 employees interviewed indicated a demand for 2823 new employees plus 1475 employees that would be needed due to growth and turnover in a twelve month period.¹

Employers felt that training needs for the 2823 employees could be met by special area schools in 88 per cent of the cases. All employers interviewed felt that mechanics, fertilizer appli-

¹Ray Agan, "A Study of Non-Farm Agricultural Occupations in Kansas" (A cooperative study, Kansas State University and Kansas State Board for Vocational Education, 1964).

cators, salesmen, nursery aides, and assembly and hauling workers could be trained by such programs.²

McCune, in a study of the need for an area vocational-technical school in the Dickinson County Community High School District, found that 40.4 per cent of those who would attend the area vocational-technical school selected farming and ranching as their occupation of highest interest.³

McCune's study further showed that 71.64 per cent of those responding indicated that they would attend an area vocational-technical school if it were available. A percentage of 18.82 felt that they would not attend and 9.54 per cent were undecided. The study showed that 88.36 per cent were willing to pay tuition to attend the area vocational-technical school.⁴

Bradley, in a study of the occupational status of Kansas 1959 high school graduates having four or more units of vocational agriculture, found that it seems evident that for those who have not had the opportunity to continue farming or

²Ibid.

³Duane McCune, "A Study of the Need for an Area Vocational Technical School in the Dickinson County Community High School District" (unpublished Master's Report, Kansas State University, Manhattan, 1964), p. 52.

⁴Ibid.

for those who have not chosen to continue, there is still a need for training beyond that which can be justified in a high school vocational agriculture curriculum.⁵

Bradley further indicated that for those graduates who have not settled with a definite occupation and for the future graduates who will not have an opportunity to remain on the farm, it is now possible to retain the value from their farm background and at the same time prepare for productive employment as technicians and skilled workers in Kansas Area Vocational-Technical Schools.⁶

⁵Howard R. Bradley, "Agriculture in Kansas Area Vocational Schools," The Agricultural Education Magazine, XXXVII (April, 1965), pp. 240-241.

⁶Ibid.

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The primary objective of this study was to determine selected characteristics of and projections for vocational agriculture in Kansas Area Vocational-Technical Schools, hereafter referred in this study as KAVTS. The author felt that information received directly from directors, assistant directors and vocational agriculture instructors in KAVTS having a vocational agriculture program in operation would constitute a reliable and usable source of information. From such information, guiding principles and patterns would evolve which would serve as a frame of reference for future establishment of vocational agriculture in KAVTS.

Data presented in the first part of this section were concerned with Form I of the interview checklist-questionnaire--Selected Characteristics of Vocational Agriculture in KAVTS. (See Appendix.) These selected characteristics were secured by interviewing the teachers of vocational agriculture in KAVTS. In multiple teacher departments of vocational agriculture, only responses of the head teacher or the teacher who was most involved in handling the total vocational agriculture program were

presented because of the anticipated similarity of the second teacher's responses.

Data presented in this section were secured from interviews of twelve vocational agriculture instructors in the twelve centers which had vocational agriculture departments as part of the KAVTS.

FORM I

SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE IN KAVTS

(Vocational Agriculture Teacher's Form)

Part I--General Information

Enrollments. On August 31, 1964, seven KAVTS began operation for the first time. The total number of high school students grades 11 and 12, post-high school students and adults in KAVTS on September 15, 1964 was 3,586.¹ This total varied greatly during the year because many short, intensive adult training programs in KAVTS commenced and terminated during the year. Current and total KAVTS enrollment figures at the time of interview were not available.

¹Kansas Educational Directory, 1964-65, Bulletin 340. Issued by Adel F. Throckmorton, State Superintendent of Public Instruction. Compiled by the State Department of Public Instruction.

Teachers interviewed in this study indicated that a total of 740 students were enrolled in vocational agriculture in KAVTS. As shown by data in Table I, 461 or 62.3 per cent of the enrollment were high school students from the area high school served. Eleven or 1.5 per cent of the total enrollment were high school students served on an area basis. All of the post-high school students enrolled in KAVTS were served on an area basis. They represented 1.6 per cent of the total enrollment. Adult Farmers, Young Farmers, and Farm Business Analysis students made up 34.6 per cent of total vocational agriculture enrollment in KAVTS. For the purpose of this study, this group was not considered to be served on an area basis since they resided in both the local and the area vocational technical school districts.

Of the remaining 484 students enrolled, 23 or 4.75 per cent of high school and post-high school students were served on an area basis.

Of a total of 472 high school students of vocational agriculture, 325 were farm boys. This constituted 68.9 per cent. Thirty-one point one (31.1%) per cent of the high school students enrolled in vocational agriculture in KAVTS lived in town.

TABLE I
STUDENTS OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE
ENROLLED IN KAVTS

Student Classification	Number	Per Cent
High school students from the area previously served.	461	62.3
High school students served on an area basis.	11	1.5
Post-high school students from the area previously served.	0	0.0
Post-high school students served on an area basis.	12	1.6
Adult Farmer, Young Farmer, and Farm Business Analysis students.	256	34.6
Total	740	100.0

As shown by data in Table II, nine different grades or courses were included in the high school vocational agriculture curriculum in KAVTS. Grade number 10 or Vocational Agriculture II was offered in one-hundred per cent of the departments. As evidenced by data in Table II, the number of credits earned corresponded to the number of hours per day spent in the course. Students in the cooperative program spent either three or four hours per day and received accordingly three or four credits.

A total of 432 or 86.9 per cent of the high school vocational agriculture students in KAVTS were enrolled in vocational agriculture grades 9-12. These grades had not been basically changed from the program followed prior to becoming a part of KAVTS. One school was offering the cooperative program before becoming a part of KAVTS. Four schools added new courses when they became a part of KAVTS.

Examples of new courses added by two KAVTS were a 3-hour Technical Agriculture block and a 3-hour course in Agriculture and Related Occupations. The instructor of the three-hour Technical Agriculture block stated that main advantages were that he was able to cover more material and cover it more thoroughly. In the 3-hour course, Agriculture and Related

TABLE II

COURSES INCLUDED IN THE HIGH SCHOOL VOCATIONAL
AGRICULTURE CURRICULUM IN KAVTS

Centers having Classes No. %	Grade or Course	No. of Centers Offering			No. of Centers Offering			No. of Students Total	Average	Per Cent in Each Grade or Course
		Hrs. Per Day	1	2	3	1	2	3		
10 83.3	9	10	0	0	0	10	0	0	132	13.2
12 100.0	10	3	9	0	0	3	9	0	145	12.1
9 75.0	11	5	4	0	0	5	4	0	100	11.1
8 66.7	12	8	0	0	0	8	0	0	55	6.9
1 8.3	Farm Mechanics	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.0
1 8.3	Farm Shop I	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	25	25.0
1 8.3	Agriculture and Related occup.	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	12	12.0
1 8.3	Technical Agriculture	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	2.0
1 8.3	Cooperative Program	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	22	22.0
Total									497	100.0

occupations, students studied about off-farm agricultural occupations. Agricultural mechanics training was also included in the course. A 3-hour farm mechanics course was offered by one department. Farm power and engine overhaul were areas covered. One department offered a Farm Shop I class in which vocational agriculture or non-vocational agriculture students were enrolled.

Data in Table III showed that four courses were included in the post-high school and adult vocational agriculture curriculum in KAVTS. The twelve Farm Mechanics students were the only students attending day school classes on the post-high school level. The students attended classes and worked in shop six hours per day. The class constituted 4.2 per cent of the total post-high school and adult enrollment.

Adult Farmer classes made up 55.1 per cent of post-high school and adult enrollment in vocational agriculture. The highest number of Adult Farmers served by one center was 110, and the lowest was 15. Overall, three centers offered nine different Adult Farmer classes and served a total enrollment of 156. Young Farmer courses were offered by 33.3 per cent of the centers in KAVTS.

TABLE III
COURSES INCLUDED IN THE POST-HIGH SCHOOL AND ADULT VOCATIONAL
AGRICULTURE CURRICULUM IN KAVTS

Centers having Classes		Course Name	Number of Students		Per Cent in Each Course
Number	Per Cent		Total	Average	
3	25.0	Adult Farmers	156	52.0	55.1
4	33.3	Young Farmers	64	16.0	22.7
2	16.7	Farm Business Analysis	51	25.5	18.0
1	8.3	Farm Mechanics	12	12.0	4.2
Total			283		100.0

Vocational Agriculture Staff. Of the fifteen instructors employed to teach vocational agriculture in twelve KAVTS centers, thirteen were classified as full-time teachers. One of this group was a full-time farm mechanics instructor. Two teachers taught part time. Their other duties were assistant director and public information director in their respective KAVTS.

The twelve vocational agriculture instructors interviewed had an average of 13.2 years teaching experience. The least number of years experience of the teachers interviewed was two and the most was 36, a range of 34 years.

Four of the twelve vocational agriculture instructors interviewed, or 33.3 per cent had masters degrees. No specialists or temporary teachers were employed to teach special lessons in any center.

In the three multiple teacher departments of vocational agriculture in KAVTS, two departments or 66.7 per cent had one teacher designated as head teacher. Hamilton,² in a study of multiple teacher departments of vocational agriculture found that less than 20 per cent of the departments studied had a

²Vance Eugene Hamilton, "Patterns of Responsibility in Multi-Teacher Departments," taken from Summaries of Studies in Agricultural Education, (North Carolina State College), 1961, No. 15.

head teacher. Kaiser, in a similar study, indicated that it was usually most important to have one teacher designated as department head. He found that the head teacher became a liaison between the school administration and the vocational agriculture department. He further found that a multiple teacher department of vocational agriculture required a great deal of cooperation among teachers.³

In the three multiple teacher departments of vocational agriculture in KAVTS, 66.7 per cent of the teachers decided cooperatively how the teaching load would be divided. Data in Table IV showed that in one case the director also decided with the teachers. In no case did the head teacher, director, or others, make the decision alone.

The three teachers of vocational agriculture also indicated that supervision of farming programs or work experience in multiple teacher departments of vocational agriculture in KAVTS was given to those students taught in the instructor's vocational agriculture classes. Teachers did not supervise students within a specialized area.

³Denver J. Kaiser, "How to Make a Multiple Teacher Program Work," The Agricultural Education Magazine, XXXI (July, 1958), p. 9.

TABLE IV
DIVISION OF TEACHING LOAD IN MULTIPLE
TEACHER DEPARTMENTS

Personnel Making Decisions	Number	Per Cent
Head Teacher	0	0.0
Both Teachers Cooperatively	2	66.7
Director	0	0.0
Director and Both Teachers Cooperatively	1	33.3
Other	0	0.0
Total	3	100.0

N = 3

Facilities. In the interviews, teachers were asked what facilities were available for vocational agriculture. It was found by the writer that 14 classrooms in 12 departments of vocational agriculture in KAVTS had an average area of 800 square feet. The largest classroom had an area of 1,500 square feet, and the smallest an area of 500 square feet, a range of 1000 square feet. Two vocational agriculture departments had two classrooms.

Data secured from the instructors indicated that 12 agricultural mechanics shops in KAVTS had an average area of 3,294 square feet. The largest shop had an area of 5,400 square feet and the smallest an area of 1,500 square feet, a range of 3,900 square feet.

Data shown in Table V showed that greenhouse facilities were planned in two centers. In addition, one small animal room was planned. A separate office was present in 66.7 per cent of the vocational agriculture departments.

One department of vocational agriculture in KAVTS had new facilities. Two new classrooms and one 50' by 80' agricultural mechanics shop had been constructed since becoming a part of KAVTS. New equipment in this shop consisted of ten new arc welders, three new oxyacetylene welders, one drill press, one hydraulic press, three grinders, one metal bender, one dynamometer, and smaller hand tools and equipment. New classroom facilities included sets of farm mechanics, livestock, crops, and feeds and feeding books.

Three other departments of vocational agriculture had added new equipment. In two departments less than \$100 worth of farm mechanics tools were added. One department added a 14" power grinder and one department added a soil test kit. Eight

vocational agriculture departments had added no new facilities since becoming a part of KAVTS.

TABLE V
FACILITIES FOR VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE
IN KAVTS

	Yes		No		Planned	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Laboratory	4	33.3	8	66.7	0	0.0
Separate Office	8	66.7	4	33.3	0	0.0
Greenhouse	0	0.0	10	83.3	2	16.7
School Farm	1	8.3	11	91.7	0	0.0

Part II--Curriculum

High School Curriculum. During the interview, teachers were asked to respond to questions concerning high school Technical Agriculture. Data in Table VI showed that twelve vocational agriculture instructors in KAVTS spent 52.3 per cent of technical agriculture time teaching production agriculture. One teacher felt that he spent a high of 73 per cent of his time teaching production agriculture and another a low of 20 per cent,

a range of 53 per cent. A higher range existed in agribusiness where one teacher spent 65 per cent of his time and one teacher spent no time. Counseling, crop and animal sciences, and miscellaneous, representing 7.1 per cent of time taught, made up other responses.

TABLE VI
TIME SPENT TEACHING TECHNICAL
AGRICULTURE IN KAVTS

Phases	Average Per Cent of Time	Per Cent of Time		
		High	Low	Range
Production	52.3	73	20	53
Leadership	10.0	15	5	10
Marketing	7.5	15	0	12
Services	6.3	12	0	12
Agribusiness	16.8	65	0	65
Other	7.1	30	0	30
Total	100.0			

N = 12 Schools

Few changes had been made in the high school vocational agriculture curriculum since becoming a part of KAVTS. Four instructors interviewed stated that areas added included increased teaching about off-farm occupations or agribusiness. One teacher taught more land judging and conservation. No areas of technical agriculture were dropped.

The primary way of teaching off-farm agricultural occupations and opportunities in KAVTS was to teach about clusters of occupations, as shown in Table VII. Eight instructors or 66.6 per cent indicated that they taught about clusters of off-farm agricultural occupations. Two instructors indicated that they taught about specific off-farm agricultural occupations and two said they did not teach about or for off-farm agricultural occupations. No teacher taught for specific or clusters of off-farm occupations as their primary way of teaching.

Some of the main specific and clusters of off-farm agricultural occupations which twelve vocational agriculture teachers taught about are listed in Table VIII. Most often taught about specific occupations were veterinarian and county agent. Agricultural services (feed, seed, fertilizer), professional agriculturalists, livestock occupations, farm

TABLE VII
PRIMARY WAY OF TEACHING OFF-FARM AGRICULTURAL
OCCUPATIONS IN KAVTS

Off-Farm Agricultural Occupations	Number	Per Cent
About specific	2	16.7
About clusters	8	66.6
For specific	0	0.0
For clusters	0	0.0
None of above	2	16.7
Total	12	100.0

implement business, and the opportunities in the meat industry were the most often taught about clusters of agricultural occupations.

Nine vocational agriculture instructors or 75 per cent stated that they did not teach for any specific off-farm agricultural occupations. Ten did not teach for any clusters. Specific occupations taught for were livestock buyers, crop inspectors and part-time farmer. Clusters of off-farm occupations taught for were the agricultural sales and service

TABLE VIII
SPECIFIC AND CLUSTERS OF OFF-FARM AGRICULTURAL
OCCUPATIONS TAUGHT ABOUT

Specific Occupation	Number Teaching	Clusters Occupation	Number Teaching
Veterinarian	6	Agricultural Services (Feed, Seed, Fertilizer)	5
County Agent	3	Professional Agriculturalists	3
Soil Conservation	2	Livestock Occupations	3
Production Credit Man	2	Farm Implement Business	3
Livestock Commission Man	2	Meat Industry	3
None	2	None	2
Farm Bank Representative	1	Animal Nutrition	2
Public Relations Man	1	Agricultural Processing	2
Auctioneer	1	Soil Conservation	1
Horticulturalist	1	Agricultural Communications	1
Artificial Inseminator	1	Agricultural Education	1
Biochemist	1	Agricultural Research	1
Grain Grader	1	Agricultural Sales	1
Crop Inspector	1	Crop Occupations	1
Agricultural Journalism	1	Electrical and Plumbing Trades	1
Irrigation Man	1	Agricultural Products	1

TABLE VIII(continued)

Specific Occupation	Number Teaching	Clusters Occupation	Number Teaching
Crop Speciality Man	1	Horticulture	1
Farm Chemical Man	1	Dairy Industry	1
		Custom Farm Operator	1
		Laboratory Assistants	1

N = 12

businesses. It seemed apparent to the writer from data shown that vocational agriculture instructors in KAVTS were teaching about rather than for off-farm agricultural occupations on the high school level.

Agricultural Mechanics. When interviewing instructors about agricultural mechanics, nine of twelve vocational agriculture instructors in KAVTS or 75 per cent stated that no areas had been added to the agricultural mechanics curriculum since becoming a part of KAVTS. Twenty-five per cent indicated that more farm power and machinery instruction were added. No areas were dropped by 91.8 per cent of the instructors. One instructor

dropped Farm Shop II in which the areas of farm power and farm electrification were previously taught.

With regard to teaching agricultural mechanics, responses of twelve vocational agriculture instructors showed that they were of the opinion that they spent 59.2 per cent of their time developing knowledges and skills for use on the farm and 30.8 per cent of their time developing knowledges and skills for off-farm agricultural occupations. Ten per cent of their time was spent developing knowledges and skills for off-farm occupations not related to agriculture.

Opinions of twelve vocational agriculture instructors in KAVTS as to the importance of supervised practice or on-farm instruction indicated that 50 per cent regarded supervision as very important. As data in Table IX showed, three or 24.9 per cent indicated supervised instruction as average importance or less. Of the six vocational agriculture instructors indicating that on-farm instruction was very important, three stated that supervised practice was given 3-4 times per student per year, two stated 5-6 times per year, and one said he gave supervised, on-farm instruction 12 times per student per year.

Data in Table X showed that 58.5 per cent of the vocational agriculture instructors provided on-farm instruction or

TABLE IX
IMPORTANCE OF SUPERVISED PRACTICE
OR ON-FARM INSTRUCTION

Importance	Number	Per Cent
Very important	6	50.0
More than average importance	3	25.0
Average importance	1	8.3
Less than average importance	1	8.3
Little importance	1	8.3
Total	12	99.9

supervised practice from 3 to 6 times per student per year. One instructor indicated that this service was provided to every student every month. Another instructor supervised students daily on the school farm.

As evidenced by data in Table XI, 33.3 per cent of the vocational agriculture departments in KAVTS took 41 or more class field trips per year to study production methods, approved practices and learn skills. Twenty-one to thirty class field trips per year were also taken by 33.3 per cent of the departments.

TABLE X
NUMBER OF SUPERVISED PRACTICES OR ON-FARM
INSTRUCTION GIVEN PER STUDENT
PER YEAR

Times	Number	Per Cent
0-2	3	24.0
3-4	5	41.8
5-6	2	16.7
7 or more	2	16.7
Total	12	100.0

The most field trips taken of this type by one department was 140 field trips per year. The average number of field trips for all 12 departments was 41.3 field trips per year. Two departments of vocational agriculture took a low of 10 field trips per year to study production methods, approved practices and learn skills.

Class field trips of this type were used extensively by 75 per cent of the vocational agriculture departments.

Data indicated that all twelve vocational agriculture instructors interviewed felt that emphasis given farming programs

in relation to the rest of the vocational agriculture program since becoming a part of KAVTS had remained about the same.

TABLE XI

TIMES PER YEAR CLASS FIELD TRIPS WERE TAKEN
TO FARMS TO STUDY PRODUCTION METHODS
APPROVED PRACTICES AND LEARN SKILLS

Field Trips Per Year	Number	Per Cent
0-10	3	25.0
11-20	0	0.0
21-30	4	33.3
31-40	1	8.4
41 or more	4	33.3
Total	12	100.0

Cooperative Program. One vocational agriculture department of the twelve interviewed in KAVTS had an agricultural business placement, work experience, on-farm placement, or earning-learning program cooperatively in effect for high school vocational agriculture students. The program in effect was an agricultural business placement cooperative program.

The cooperative program in this vocational agriculture department was offered for either three or four hours credit. Students worked two hours of school time each day for two hours credit. Students could also work after school or on Saturday. A one-hour cooperative seminar was held in the classroom each day to study employer-employee relationships. One credit was given for this seminar. An additional credit was earned by the students who spent another supervised hour in the classroom studying information essential in his occupation or field of work.

The cooperative program in this vocational agriculture department was offered to grade 12 students. The chief areas in which the cooperative training were carried out included meatcutting, nursery man, greenhouse workers, florists' helpers, produce managers in supermarkets, veterinarians' assistants, and businesses providing agricultural sales and services.

The vocational agriculture teacher and the parents ranked first and second in importance in helping the student decide upon his area of work or study. Students in this cooperative program worked approximately 3.5 hours per day plus Saturday or 22 hours per week. Students completing the training received 900 hours on job training per year.

The cooperative program was designed to give the student training to the extent that he developed job proficiency and was ready for placement. Students received payment for their work. The wage rate was agreed on between the employer and the student. It was felt that low starting pay with small periodic raises gave increased incentive to the students.

The cooperative program was planned by the vocational agriculture instructor and the coordinator, who in this case were the same person. The vocational agriculture instructor and the coordinator were responsible for the supervision and rating of students' experiences along with the employer. The employer turned in periodic evaluation sheets to the instructor and the vocational agriculture instructor supervised on-job experiences of students.

A written agreement among the student, school, and employer outlined the tentative training plan and defined the major phases in which the student would receive training.

In obtaining placement in the cooperative program, students first listed interests and determined who a possible employer might be. The vocational agriculture instructor made the initial contact with the employer. The student then made

application for the job and obtained an interview. In this manner, students obtained their own placement.

No class field trips were taken to different businesses in the cooperative program. The cooperative program was designed to provide knowledges and skills for placement in an occupation.

Future Farmers of America. Seventy-five per cent of the vocational agriculture instructors interviewed indicated that no changes had been made in FFA activities and participation since becoming a part of KAVTS. One stated that it increased the FFA Chapter membership because of the larger area served. One instructor stated that participation by students in the cooperative program had decreased. Another instructor stated that participation had decreased and that FFA had been affected adversely.

Of the eleven students served on an area basis, seven or 63.6 per cent participated in FFA activities. Students traveling long distances did not participate.

Opinions as to what would best indicate emphasis given to FFA in relation to the rest of the vocational agriculture program since becoming a part of KAVTS were that emphasis had remained about the same in 91.7 per cent of the departments. One instructor felt that emphasis had decreased.

Responsibilities for advising the FFA Chapter in three multiple teacher departments of vocational agriculture in KAVTS were carried out by both teachers cooperatively in two departments. One teacher had the responsibility of advising the FFA Chapter in the third multiple teacher department.

Post-High School Curriculum. One KAVTS offered vocational agriculture courses to post-high school students. In this vocational agriculture department, twelve post-high school students were studying farm mechanics six hours per day. The course was developed by a survey of area needs and by request of the students. There was no organization on the post-high school level for students enrolled in vocational agriculture courses. Being a multiple teacher department, both teachers were cooperatively responsible for teaching the post-high school Farm Mechanics Course. The course was designed to fit students for immediate employment upon termination of their studies.

Data in Table XII showed opinions voiced by twelve vocational agriculture instructors about whether certain courses were needed in their area on the post-high school level, their capability of teaching such a course, and their need for additional training to teach this course on the post-high school level in KAVTS.

As shown by Table XII, opinions were that agricultural chemicals, fertilizer, grain merchandising, farm machinery repair, farm management, farm business analysis, and young farmers were courses needed in 91.7 per cent of the cases.

Teachers responding to areas needed felt 100 per cent capable of teaching farm shopwork, rural recreation, feeds and feeding, adult farmers and young farmers. Greater than 80 per cent indicated that they needed additional training to teach diesel mechanics, L. P. Power Units, hydraulics and feed mill operation.

It should be noted that although numbers needed in some areas of instruction were small, their significance to the particular area that responded was of no less importance. For example, a need for irrigation equipment was indicated in 50 per cent of the centers, however, this percentage made irrigation no less important in Western Kansas.

TABLE XII

OPINIONS ABOUT NEEDS AND CAPABILITY OF
TEACHING POST-HIGH SCHOOL COURSES

Areas of Instruction	Needed		Felt Capable of Teaching		Needed Add. Training	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Farm Machinery Repair	11	91.7	5	45.4	6	54.6
Farm Power	10	83.3	3	30.0	7	70.0
Diesel Mechanics	5	41.7	1	20.0	4	80.0
L. P. Power Units	9	75.0	1	11.1	8	88.9
Hydraulics	7	58.3	1	14.3	6	85.7
Irrigation Equipment	6	50.0	2	33.3	4	66.7
Farm Shopwork	8	66.7	8	100.0	0	0.0
Rural Electrification	6	50.0	3	50.0	3	50.0
Farm Buildings and Conveniences	7	58.3	4	57.1	3	42.9
Soil and Water Management	8	66.7	7	87.5	1	12.5
Rural Recreation	1	8.3	1	100.0	0	0.0
Horticulture	6	50.0	5	83.3	1	16.7
Floriculture	6	50.0	3	50.0	3	50.0
Landscaping	9	75.0	3	33.3	6	67.7
Fertilizer	11	91.7	9	81.8	2	18.2
Agricultural Chemicals	11	91.7	7	63.6	4	34.4
Grain Merchandising	11	91.7	4	34.4	7	63.6
Feed Mill Operation	7	58.3	1	14.3	6	85.7
Feeds and Feeding	10	83.3	10	100.0	0	0.0
Meat Cutting and Processing	6	50.0	2	33.3	4	66.7
Agricultural Credit	9	75.0	6	66.7	3	33.3
Agricultural Salesmanship	10	83.3	4	40.0	6	60.0
Farm Management	11	91.7	10	91.0	1	9.0
Farm Business Analysis	11	91.7	5	45.4	6	54.5
Young Farmers	11	91.7	11	100.0	0	0.0
Adult Farmers	10	83.3	10	100.0	0	0.0

N Needed = 12

FORM II

PROJECTIONS FOR VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE IN KAVTS

(Directors and Vocational Agriculture Teachers Form)

Data presented in this section were obtained by interviewing seven directors and four assistant directors of KAVTS. Twelve vocational agriculture instructors in twelve centers were also interviewed as in Form I. All seven KAVTS had directors. Assistant directors were located at Topeka, Columbus, McPherson and Newton. In this study, responses given by directors and assistant directors were grouped and presented as directors' responses unless otherwise designated. In designated cases only the seven directors' responses were given for each KAVTS. Responses of vocational agriculture instructors referred to the vocational agriculture program in their center within KAVTS.

Projections. Directors and vocational agriculture instructors were asked what would be the main purposes of vocational agriculture in KAVTS.

As shown by data in Table XIII, there was some disagreement among directors and vocational agriculture instructors as

TABLE XIII

PROJECTIONS OF WHAT WOULD BE THE MAIN PURPOSES
OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE IN KAVTS

Purposes	Directors		Instructors	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Job preparation for gainful employment	8	72.8	8	66.7
Train for off-farm agricultural occupations	6	54.6	10	83.3
Provide a basis for agricultural professions	5	45.5	9	75.0
Continue to train for farming	4	36.4	11	91.7
Develop a cooperative program	3	27.3	1	8.3
Meet employers demands for men trained in agriculture	2	18.2	0	0.0
Revise the conventional vocational agriculture program	2	18.2	1	8.3
Train for agribusiness	1	9.1	2	16.6
Furnish vocational agriculture training to a larger number	1	9.1	0	0.0
Provide specific agricultural training	3	27.3	0	0.0
Provide Post-High School specialized training	0	0.0	5	41.7
Train Young and Adult Farmers	0	0.0	3	25.0
Provide leadership for good citizenship	0	0.0	1	8.3

N = 11 Directors

N = 12 Instructors

to what would be the main purposes. Twelve or 72.8 per cent of the directors listed job preparation for gainful employment as a major purpose as did 66.7 per cent of the vocational agriculture instructors. To continue to train for farming was chosen by 91.7 per cent of the vocational agriculture instructors as a major purpose. Four or 36.4 per cent of the directors listed this as a main objective.

Job preparation for an occupation, to train for off-farm agricultural occupations, to provide a basis for agricultural professions and to continue to train for farming made up 66.7 per cent of the directors responses and 74.5 per cent of the vocational agriculture instructors responses. Five or 41.7 per cent of the vocational agriculture instructors felt that to provide post-high school specialized training in vocational agriculture was a major purpose of KAVTS.

The basic intent and concept of KAVTS was to provide vocational-technical training on an area basis to students who did not have such training on the local level. Changes which must be made in vocational agriculture in KAVTS to meet this concept were shown in Table XIV. Fifty per cent of the vocational agriculture instructors felt that a three-hour block course or courses must be offered to meet area needs. They

TABLE XIV

OPINIONS OF CHANGES WHICH MUST BE MADE IN VOCATIONAL
AGRICULTURE TO MEET THE BASIC INTENT
AND CONCEPT OF THE KAVTS

Changes	Directors		Instructors	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Change to three hour block courses	3	27.3	6	50.0
Increase training in agri-business	3	27.3	3	25.0
Add an additional instructor	5	45.5	1	8.3
Provide more extensive and adequate facilities	3	27.3	3	25.0
Provide a larger, expanded vocational agriculture program	2	18.2	2	16.6
Would not change because program was meeting local needs	0	0.0	3	25.0
Increase training on the post-high school level	0	0.0	2	16.6
Train for immediate employment	1	9.1	1	8.3

N = 11 Directors

N = 12 Instructors

felt that students traveling from other areas must receive a minimum of three hours instruction to be beneficial to them. This concept was held by 27.3 per cent of the directors. Forty-five and five tenths per cent of the directors felt that an additional instructor of vocational agriculture must be added to provide specialized instruction.

Increased training in agribusiness and provision for more extensive and adequate facilities were changes which needed to be made according to 27.3 per cent of the directors and 25 per cent of the vocational agriculture instructors. Three vocational agriculture instructors felt they would not change their program because they were meeting local needs.

Other changes listed once each by directors were that KAVTS must enroll students from other schools who were not receiving vocational agriculture training, they must inform administrators and students from other schools that vocational agriculture was available on an area basis and that these exchanges of students between local high schools and KAVTS must be made.

One director stated that their KAVTS did not intend to make high school vocational agriculture available on an area basis. Another said that they would change to a two year, grade 11 and 12 program. Other responses indicated that exploration of

the need for new courses must be done and that more local funds would have to be provided to make vocational-technical training available on an area basis.

Changes which must be made listed once each by vocational agriculture instructors were that they must meet the needs of the local people, employers and employees. One instructor stated that a division should be made after grade 9 and 10 and provide a 3 hour off-farm agricultural occupations course at that time. One instructor stated that the basic concept of providing high school vocational agriculture available on an area basis. One instructor said that changes would depend on what other schools did.

In Table XV data showed that 50 per cent of the vocational agriculture instructors and 36.4 per cent of the directors were of the opinion that farm power and machinery repair would be a new area to become a part of the post-high school vocational agriculture curriculum. Horticulture, nursery, greenhouse, landscaping and floriculture were areas mentioned in 34.3 per cent of the responses by directors and in 34.2 per cent of responses by vocational agriculture instructors. As evidenced by the data, it was the opinion of directors and vocational agriculture instructors that many new areas which would fit

TABLE XV

OPINIONS OF WHAT NEW AREAS WOULD BECOME A PART
OF THE POST-HIGH SCHOOL VOCATIONAL
AGRICULTURE CURRICULUM

Areas or Courses	Directors		Instructors	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Farm Power and Machinery Repair	4	36.4	6	50.0
Cooperative Program	3	27.3	4	33.3
Horticulture	4	36.4	4	33.3
Landscaping	2	18.2	5	41.7
Greenhouse	3	27.3	1	8.3
Nursery	2	18.2	2	16.7
Floriculture	1	9.1	2	16.7
Farm Business Analysis	2	18.2	3	25.0
Elevator Management	2	18.2	1	8.3
Livestock feed Business	2	18.2	3	25.0
Off-farm Agricultural Occupations	2	18.2	1	8.3
Young Farmer Classes	1	9.1	1	8.3
Adult Farmer Classes	1	9.1	1	8.3
Farm Machinery (Sales, Parts, Service)	1	9.1	1	8.3
Agribusiness Occupations	1	9.1	1	8.3
Three Hour Technical Agriculture Block	1	9.1	1	8.3
Food Manufacturing	1	9.1	0	0.0
Irrigation Technology	1	9.1	1	8.3
Farm Machinery Operation	1	0.1	0	0.0
Agricultural Salesmanship	0	0.0	1	8.3
Diesel	0	0.0	1	8.3
Hydraulics	0	0.0	1	8.3

N = 11 Directors N = 12 Instuctors

specific needs would become a part of the post-high school vocational agriculture curriculum.

One hundred per cent of directors and vocational agriculture instructors indicated that surveys of local, area and state needs were the main way in which they would determine what areas or courses would be taught in vocational agriculture in KAVTS. Data in Table XVI indicated that the advisory council was also an important factor in determining what courses would be taught. Forty-five and five tenths per cent of the directors and 58.3 per cent of the vocational agriculture instructors felt the advisory council was important.

It was the opinion of 45.5 per cent of directors and 66.7 per cent of vocational agriculture instructors that high school dropouts would fit into the post-high school vocational agriculture curriculum.

Three directors indicated that any high school dropout who wished to return to school would be enrolled in the high school curriculum.

As shown in Table XVII, 63.7 per cent of the directors indicated that courses to teach repetitive skills would be devised to provide for academically handicapped students.

TABLE XVI
 RESPONSES OF HOW COURSES OR AREAS TAUGHT
 WOULD BE DETERMINED

Responses	Directors		Instructors	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Surveys of local, area and state needs	11	100.0	12	100.0
Advisory Council	5	45.5	7	58.3
Recommendations by the administrator	2	18.2	4	33.3
Students' demands	4	36.4	3	25.0
Experience of the teacher	2	18.2	2	16.7
Employers' demands	1	9.1	3	25.0
Employment agencies	1	9.1	1	8.3
Equipment available	0	0.0	2	16.7
Committee of KAVTS vocational agriculture instructors	0	0.0	1	8.3

N = 11 Directors

N = 12 Instructors

The same view was held by 33.3 per cent of the vocational agriculture instructors interviewed.

Development of lower ability training programs and provision of a sheltered workshop or special education class were responses given by 36.4 per cent of the directors. One director stated that programmed instruction and closed circuit television would play a role in training academically handicapped students in the future. Individual attention would also be provided in small classes. Two directors and four vocational agriculture instructors were of the opinion that no provisions would be made unless students were capable of being educated.

Data in Table XVIII indicated that 100 per cent of the directors of KAVTS felt that cooperative training would be carried on in vocational agriculture. None of the directors felt that cooperative training would be limited to the post-high school curriculum. Two vocational agriculture instructors in auxiliary centers felt that cooperative training would not be carried on. Data indicated that cooperative training would be carried on at both high school and post-high school level depending on the type of program offered. One instructor stated that employers were reluctant to hire high school students in a cooperative training program because they were too young and immature.

TABLE XVII
PROVISION FOR TRAINING ACADEMICALLY
HANDICAPPED STUDENTS

Provisions	Directors		Instructors	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Devise courses to teach repetitive skills	7	63.7	4	33.3
Develop a lower ability training program	4	36.4	1	8.3
Provide a sheltered workshop or special education class	4	36.4	3	25.0
Determine students job capability by means of testing	2	18.2	2	16.7
Develop a class in which students can succeed	2	18.2	0	0.0
Do not know	1	9.1	3	25.0
No provisions would be made unless students are capable of being educated	2	18.2	4	33.3
Gear instruction to individual needs	1	9.1	3	25.0
Use programmed instruction	1	9.1	0	0.0
Use closed circuit television	1	9.1	0	0.0
It is not our purpose to train these people	1	9.1	0	0.0

TABLE XVIII
PROJECTED LEVEL OF COOPERATIVE
TRAINING IN KAVTS

Level	Directors		Instructors	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
High School Curriculum	5	45.5	4	33.3
Post-High School Curriculum	0	0.0	3	25.0
Both High School and Post-High School	6	54.5	3	25.0
Will not be carried on	0	0.0	2	16.7
Total	11	100.0	12	100.0

One hundred per cent of the directors of KAVTS felt that farm machinery dealers would be an area that would best fit the vocational agriculture cooperative program. This same view was held by 83.3 per cent of the vocational agriculture instructors as shown in Table XIX. Two instructors stated that they did not know what areas would best fit the cooperative training program.

The five areas of farm machinery dealers, feed companies, grain elevators, farm supply, and horticulture programs made up 67.2 per cent of directors responses and 56.7 per cent of vocational agriculture instructors responses.

As shown by the data, instructors listed twenty-three areas which would fit the vocational agriculture program and directors listed seventeen areas. Twelve vocational agriculture instructors listed a total of sixty-seven responses, an average of 5.6 responses and eleven directors responded a total of sixty-one times, an average of 5.5 responses.

In general, directors and vocational agriculture instructors also felt that the areas listed were the off-farm agricultural occupations in which training was needed.

When asked about the degree of specialization in vocational agriculture in KAVTS, 63.6 per cent of the directors were of the opinion that the trend was for vocational agriculture for high school students to be away from the broad basic coverage of knowledges and skills and toward specialization. Forty-one per cent of the vocational agriculture instructors felt this was the trend and 7 or 58.3 per cent stated that this was not the trend in high school vocational agriculture.

In general, directors felt that addition of an additional instructor would increase specialization. Thirty-six and four tenths per cent of the directors felt that the trend was not toward specialization in high school vocational agriculture.

TABLE XIX

AREAS WHICH WOULD BEST FIT THE VOCATIONAL
AGRICULTURE COOPERATIVE TRAINING PROGRAM

Areas	Directors		Instructors	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Farm Machinery Dealers (Sales, Services, Parts, Repair)	11	100.0	10	83.3
Feed Companies	7	63.6	6	50.0
Grain Elevators	9	81.8	6	60.0
Farm Supply (Feed, Seed, Fertilizer, Chemicals)	8	72.7	10	83.0
Veterinarians Assistant	3	27.3	4	33.3
Farm Management	1	9.1	0	0.0
Meatcutting	3	27.3	0	0.0
Supermarkets	2	18.2	2	16.7
Horticulture Program (Nursery, Greenhouse)	6	54.6	6	50.0
Floriculture	2	18.2	0	0.0
Landscaping	2	18.2	2	16.7
City Park Department	1	9.1	0	0.0
Recreational Area Development	1	9.1	0	0.0
Highway Department	1	9.1	0	0.0

TABLE XIX (continued)

Areas	Directors		Instructors	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Feedlot Operation	2	18.2	2	16.7
Irrigation	1	9.1	2	16.7
Real Estate Appraisal	1	9.1	1	8.3
On Farm Cooperative Program	0	0.0	1	8.3
Fertilizer Applicator	0	0.0	1	8.3
Farm Machinery Manufacturing	0	0.0	1	8.3
Dairy Field Man	0	0.0	1	8.3
Farm Laborers	0	0.0	1	8.3
Livestock Management	0	0.0	1	8.3
Soil Conservation	0	0.0	2	16.7
Meat Packing Company	0	0.0	3	25.0
Poultry Industry	0	0.0	1	8.3
Fertilizer Processing Plant	0	0.0	1	8.3
Milk Processing Plant	0	0.0	1	8.3
Do not know	0	0.0	2	16.7

N = 11 Directors

N = 12 Instructors

In general, directors felt that addition of an additional instructor would increase specialization. Thirty-six and four tenths per cent of the directors felt that the trend was not toward specialization in high school vocational agriculture.

It was felt by 63.6 per cent of the directors and 66.7 per cent of the vocational agriculture instructors that specialization of vocational agriculture in KAVTS would be to the extent that a student would be prepared to enter a specific agricultural occupation upon graduation from high school.

As shown in Table XX, 54.6 per cent of the directors and 41.7 per cent of the vocational agriculture instructors stated that a main advantage of vocational agriculture being a part of KAVTS was that it made this training available to those students who attended high schools where no vocational agriculture program was offered.

The data showed that advantages were varied, apparently to individual situations. Two instructors or 16.7 per cent felt that there was no advantage of vocational agriculture being in KAVTS as compared to the regular high school program. None of the directors expressed this feeling.

As evidenced by Table XXI, disadvantages were even more varied. Vocational agriculture instructors felt that KAVTS

TABLE XX

ADVANTAGES OF THE VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE PROGRAM
BEING A PART OF KAVTS

Responses	Directors		Instructors	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Made vocational agriculture available to those students who attended high schools where no vocational agriculture program was offered	6	54.6	5	41.7
Increased finances	2	18.3	5	41.7
Provided more and better facilities and equipment	3	27.3	3	25.0
Could specialize training offered	1	9.1	2	16.7
Could better meet employment needs	4	36.4	1	8.3
Increased vocational agriculture enrollment	2	18.2	1	8.3
Made program large enough to support a two teacher department	2	18.2	0	0.0
Were not bothered by extra-curricular activities	1	9.1	1	8.3
Time was more usefully spent in a three hour block	1	9.1	1	8.3
Could better identify the needs of the area	0	0.0	1	8.3

TABLE XX (continued)

Responses	Directors		Instructors	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Could expand into off-farm agricultural occupation	0	0.0	1	8.3
Increases prestige of the department	0	0.0	1	8.3
Old facilities could be used for other purposes	0	0.0	1	8.3
Trained for immediate employment	1	9.1	0	0.0
None	0	0.0	2	16.7

N = 11 Directors

N = 12 Instructors

requirements hurt all aspects of the FFA, particularly the awards program; limited the opportunity for leadership training, and made students define an occupation too soon. Transportation of students was the chief disadvantage listed by three directors and four directors stated there was no disadvantage of vocational agriculture being a part of KAVTS.

Other responses varied widely with vocational agriculture instructors stating more disadvantages than directors.

TABLE XXI

DISADVANTAGES OF THE VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE PROGRAM
BEING A PART OF KAVTS

Responses	Directors		Instructors	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Hurts all aspects of the FFA	1	9.1	5	41.7
Hurts the FFA awards program	1	9.1	5	41.7
Hurts farming programs	1	9.1	3	25.0
Transportation of students	3	27.3	0	0.0
No disadvantage	4	36.4	0	0.0
Reduces personal contact with parents	1	9.1	2	16.7
Makes students define an occupation too soon	0	0.0	3	25.0
More administration time is required	0	0.0	2	16.7
Limits the opportunity for leadership training	0	0.0	4	33.3
Hard to coordinate 3-hour block with high school	1	9.1	0	0.0
One hour programs do not fit into training for gainful employment	2	18.2	0	0.0
Forces curriculum and philosophy change	1	9.1	0	0.0
Does not prepare for a specific job	1	9.1	1	8.3

TABLE XXI (continued)

Responses	Directors		Instructors	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
KAVTS requirements hurt vocational agriculture program and the students	0	0.0	1	8.3
High school vocational agriculture does not fit into KAVTS	0	0.0	1	8.3
Have no way to finance adult work	0	0.0	1	8.3
Changing to a 3-hour block	0	0.0	1	8.3
Too crowded	0	0.0	1	8.3
Not enough tools and equipment	0	0.0	1	8.3
Hard to mix high school, post-high school and adults in one building	0	0.0	1	8.3
Lack of supervision and communication in auxiliary schools	0	0.0	1	8.3
Limits agricultural training for students desiring to go to college in an agricultural field	0	0.0	1	8.3
Elimination of grade 9 and 10 will reduce interest and feeders to the program	0	0.0	1	8.3

N = 11 Directors

N = 12 Instructors

It was found that 63.6 per cent of the directors and 33.3 per cent of the vocational agriculture instructors felt that guidance personnel would be employed by KAVTS. Instructors indicated that high school guidance personnel were serving vocational agriculture students in eight departments. Three or 27.3 per cent of the directors stated that high school guidance personnel would be trained in vocational guidance to meet the needs of students in KAVTS.

Ten or 90.9 per cent of the directors felt that placement services would be offered in KAVTS. Seventy-five per cent of the vocational agriculture instructors held this same viewpoint. One director stated that placement would be the secret of success of KAVTS.

As shown in Table XXII, directors felt that an average of 67.3 per cent and vocational agriculture instructors felt that an average of 63.1 per cent of post-high school students completing training in vocational agriculture in KAVTS would be placed in home and surrounding counties. Range of response varied greatly with location of the schools, some schools being close to state lines where out of state placement was anticipated. Data showed that 89.5 per cent of the directors and 87.5 per cent

TABLE XXII

PROJECTIONS OF WHERE POST-HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS
COMPLETING VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE TRAINING
IN KAVTS WOULD BE PLACED

Responses	Directors Average Per Cent	Instructors Average Per Cent
Home and surrounding counties	67.3	63.1
Kansas	22.2	24.4
Out of state	10.5	12.5
Total	100.0	100.0

N = 11 Directors

N = 12 Instructors

of vocational agriculture instructors were of the opinion that placement would be in Kansas and home and surrounding counties.

Data in Table XXIII showed that 72.7 per cent of the directors and 66.7 per cent of the instructors were of the opinion that additional instructors for specialized areas of vocational agriculture would be obtained from vocational agriculture instructors prepared in specialized areas. Two directors and one instructor stated that it depended upon the degree of specialization of the courses offered; the more specialized,

the greater tendency to hire proven competent men in these areas.

For example, a competent and experienced mechanic would be hired to teach diesel mechanics. A teaching degree would not be required. One director stated that vocational agriculture instructors would be hired only if they had work experience in their specialty. One instructor was of the opinion that vocational agriculture instructors would be obtained as additional teachers because they could be hired for less money than could experienced men with a specialty.

Regarding specialization of training, it was the opinion of 90.9 per cent of the vocational agriculture instructors interviewed that the vocational agriculture instructor would become more and more a specialist in a particular subject matter field. One director did not feel that high school vocational agriculture would require this specialty. One director pointed out that as multiple teacher departments increased, specialization would increase.

It was the opinion of seven directors of KAVTS that twenty-eight instructors would be teaching vocational agriculture in seven KAVTS three years from now. As data in Table XXIV showed, eleven instructors projected the same total number, 28, in

TABLE XXIII

OPINIONS OF WHERE QUALIFIED INSTRUCTORS FOR
SPECIALIZED AREAS WOULD BE OBTAINED

Responses	Directors		Instructors	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
From competent men in specialized areas	1	9.1	3	25.0
From vocational agriculture instructors prepared in specialized areas	8	72.7	8	66.7
Depends on specialization of courses offered	2	18.2	1	8.3
Total	11	100.0	12	100.0

projecting the number of teachers in their respective center. Instructors in three auxiliary centers of the Southeast KAVTS felt that their departments would not expand into multiple teacher departments of vocational agriculture.

Directors felt that there would be a total increase of thirteen instructors in KAVTS in the next three years, an average increase of 1.82 teachers per school. High and low ranges of increase would be three instructors in one KAVTS to one instructor in three KAVTS.

One hundred per cent of vocational agriculture instructors and 90.9 per cent of the directors were of the opinion that there was a trend in KAVTS toward the divisions of vocational education to lose their identity and merely become a part of the total vocational education program. One director stated that this was not the trend in multi-centered schools.

Two directors expressed that in KAVTS team teaching between and among different divisions of vocational education would help the divisions become a part of the total vocational-technical program.

One director stated that administratively the divisions of vocational education would not lose their identity, however, in individual KAVTS, coordinated efforts between divisions would be made to put on the total vocational education program.

Three instructors of vocational agriculture stated that instruction needed to be coordinated between divisions in some cases. One instructor pointed out that there were divisions as far as students were concerned, however, instructors correlated activities.

Responses by 81.8 per cent of the directors and 91.7 per cent of the vocational agriculture instructors interviewed indicated that adult and post-high school enrollment would

TABLE XXIV

PROJECTED NUMBER OF TEACHERS IN KAVTS
THREE YEARS FROM NOW

School	<u>DIRECTORS</u>		Center	<u>INSTRUCTORS</u>	
	Number of Teachers Per School			Number of Teachers Per Center	
	1965	1968		1965	1968
North Central KAVTS	2	5	Goodland	2	4
Northwest KAVTS	2	4	Dodge City	1	2
Southwest KAVTS	1	3	Beloit	2	5
Central KAVTS	2	5	Newton	1	2
Southeast KAVTS	6	7	McPherson	1	2
Flint Hills KAVTS	1	2	Coffeyville	1	3
Northeast KAVTS	1	2	Columbus	2	2
			Elk City	1	1
			Caney	1	1
			Howard	1	1
			Emporia	1	3
			Topeka	1	2
Total	15	28		15	28

N = 7 Directors

N = 12 Instructors

increase in vocational agriculture in KAVTS. Two or 18.2 per cent of the directors and one instructor stated that they did not know if adult and post-high school enrollment would increase.

Data in Table XXV showed that 54.5 per cent of the directors and 66.6 per cent of the instructors in KAVTS felt that a full time vocational agriculture instructor was needed to teach Young Farmers, Adult Farmers and Farm Business Analysis classes.

One instructor commented that response in adult farmer work has been tremendous, that people wanted to learn no matter how old they were. Another commented that there was a need for this training, but no funds were available to provide adult education on this basis in KAVTS.

TABLE XXV

PROJECTIONS OF THE NEED FOR A FULL TIME VOCATIONAL
AGRICULTURE INSTRUCTOR TO TEACH YOUNG
FARMERS, ADULT FARMERS AND FARM
BUSINESS ANALYSIS CLASSES

Responses	Directors		Instructors	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Yes	6	54.5	8	66.6
No	1	9.1	2	16.7
Part Time	4	36.4	2	16.7
Total	11	100.0	12	100.0

According to Table XXVI, farm management, farm business analysis, and fertilizers seemed to be the areas in which most instructors and directors felt instruction would be provided for Adult and Young Farmers in KAVTS. Thirty-six and four tenths per cent of the directors also felt instruction would depend on farmers' needs. Three directors and one vocational agriculture instructor indicated that they did not know what areas instruction would be offered.

In Table XXVII, seven directors projected a total enrollment of 1280 students in their KAVTS three years from now. Twelve vocational agriculture instructors projected enrollments for their departments as 1288, very close to the projected enrollments of the directors. Compared with the present total enrollment of 740, projected enrollment in three years would be up 74.3 per cent. In these terms, post-high school enrollment would increase more than any other type of enrollment. Adult enrollment would more than double. Percentages of different levels by directors and instructors closely correlated, with instructors feeling more students correlated, with instructors feeling more students would enroll in adult courses and directors projecting a greater increase in post-high school courses.

TABLE XXVI

AREAS IN WHICH AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION WOULD BE
PROVIDED FOR YOUNG AND ADULT FARMERS

Areas	Directors		Instructors	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Farm management	5	45.5	7	58.3
Farm business analysis	6	54.6	4	33.3
Fertilizer	3	27.3	5	41.7
Feeds and feeding	2	18.2	3	25.0
Soils	1	9.1	2	16.6
Crops	0	0.0	3	25.0
Livestock production and marketing	0	0.0	3	25.0
Farm machinery maintenance	1	9.1	2	16.6
Depends on farmers' needs	4	36.4	2	16.6
Welding	0	0.0	1	8.3
Insect control	0	0.0	1	8.3
Crop and animal diseases	0	0.0	1	8.3
Ag chemicals	1	9.1	1	8.3
Gain and livestock futures	0	0.0	1	8.3
Do not know	3	27.3	1	8.3

N = 11 Directors

N = 12 Instructors

Three or 42.8 per cent of the directors felt there would be no post-high vocational agriculture courses in their KAVTS. Seven or 58.3 per cent of the vocational agriculture instructors felt that no post-high school courses would be offered in their departments and two felt that no adult programs would be offered.

TABLE XXVII

PROJECTED ENROLLMENT IN VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE IN
KAVTS THREE YEARS FROM NOW

	Present Enrollment	Projected by			
		Directors Number	Per Cent	Instructors Number	Per Cent
High School	472	540	41.8	533	41.5
Post-High School	12	220	17.1	200	15.5
Adult	256	530	41.1	555	43.0
Total	740	1290	100.0	1288	100.0

N = 7 Directors N = 12 Instructors

Over one-half of the directors and vocational agriculture instructors indicated that there was no school, student, or community reaction to vocational agriculture in KAVTS as shown in Table XXVIII. In general, the remainder of the directors

and instructors felt that reaction was favorable. One instructor and one director indicated that the vocational agriculture program was highly accepted because of the training it provided post-high school students and adults.

One hundred per cent of directors and vocational agriculture instructors indicated that an advisory council would be set up to help coordinate vocational agriculture activities in KAVTS. The general feeling was that the council would be made up of farmers, professional agriculturalists, and agricultural businessmen and manufacturers. Directors and instructors felt that the advisory council's recommendations would be instrumental in developing vocational agriculture curriculums in KAVTS.

Table XXIX shows responses of eleven directors and twelve vocational agriculture instructors concerning how the vocational agriculture program in KAVTS would affect the FFA organization. Four or 36.4 per cent of the directors and 41.7 per cent of the instructors were of the opinion that FFA would be seriously reduced or eliminated. They further expressed the need of a four year program for effective FFA participation.

Three directors stated that there would be no effect on the FFA program. Other responses varied. One vocational agriculture instructor stated that the vocational-technical concept

TABLE XXVIII

SCHOOL, STUDENT AND COMMUNITY REACTION TO
VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE IN KAVTS

Reaction	Directors		Instructors	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
No Reaction	6	54.5	8	66.7
Mixed Reaction	1	9.1	1	8.3
Favorable Reaction	3	27.3	2	16.7
Favorable reaction beyond expectations	1	9.1	1	8.3
Total	11	100.0	12	100.0

N = 11 Directors

N = 12 Instructors

of what vocational agriculture in KAVTS should be was what would affect the FFA. One director stated that the FFA should not be a part of KAVTS in line with the purposes of gainful employment.

Ninety point nine per cent of the directors and 83.4 per cent of the vocational agriculture instructors stated that they were of the opinion that no student organization would be developed for post-high school students of vocational agriculture in KAVTS. One director and one instructor stated that all post-high school KAVTS students were members of the junior college

activities. One instructor stated that his FFA students were a part of an Area Vocational Club, however this was not on the post-high school level. One director said that he did not believe an organization would be set up for post-high school students because they were there for the purpose of gaining technical training and because a large number of students would be commuting.

TABLE XXIX

RESPONSES OF HOW FFA WOULD BE
AFFECTED IN KAVTS

Responses	Directors		Instructors	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
If three hour courses were offered on the Junior-Senior level it would eliminate FFA in KAVTS	1	9.1	4	33.3
Seriously reduce or eliminate it, FFA needs a 4-year program	4	36.4	5	41.7
Increase the number of FFA members	0	0.0	3	25.0
If we continue like now, no problem	1	9.1	3	25.0
Strengthen the FFA program, more meaning, more pride	1	9.1	0	0.0

TABLE XXIX (continued)

Responses	Directors		Instructors	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
If we truly become a vocational-technical school, it will hurt the FFA program	0	0.0	1	8.3
FFA shouldn't be a part of KAVTS in line with gainful employment	1	9.1	0	0.0
No effect on the FFA program	3	27.3	0	0.0
Will increase the awards program because more specialization can be given to students if we retain a 4-year high school vocational program	0	0.0	1	8.3
Will hurt the FFA awards program	0	0.0	2	16.6
Handicap area students coming to night meetings	0	0.0	1	8.3
Will hurt FFA leadership program	0	0.0	1	8.3
Vocational-Technical concept of what vocational agriculture in KAVTS should be was what would affect the FFA	0	0.0	1	8.3

N = 11 Directors

N = 12 Instructors

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The central purpose of this study was to determine selected characteristics of and projections for vocational agriculture in KAVTS. It was a further purpose to compile selected basic information which could be used as guidelines in the future establishment and maintenance of vocational agriculture in KAVTS.

Twelve vocational agriculture departments in seven KAVTS were involved in the study. Data were obtained by use of an interview checklist-questionnaire developed with the aid of an informal panel of consultants.

The interview checklist-questionnaire was divided into two parts, Form I and Form II. Twelve vocational agriculture instructors were interviewed about the selected characteristics of vocational agriculture in KAVTS in Form I. These twelve instructors along with eleven directors and assistant directors of KAVTS responded to Form II dealing with projections for vocational agriculture in KAVTS. A 100 per cent response was obtained.

A simple analysis of data compiled from completed survey forms indicated a variation of judgments and opinions.

The following conclusions were considered as basic findings of the study:

(1) Of a total of 740 students in KAVTS, eleven or 1.5 per cent represented high school students served on an area basis. This number represented 2.3 per cent of the total high school vocational agriculture enrollment.

(2) All twelve or 100 per cent of post-high school students enrolled in day school vocational agriculture in KAVTS were served on an area basis.

(3) Two-thirds of the vocational agriculture departments had added no new facilities or equipment since becoming a part of KAVTS.

(4) Two-thirds of the vocational agriculture instructors interviewed stated that the primary way of teaching off-farm agricultural occupations in KAVTS was to teach about clusters of occupations.

(5) One vocational agriculture department in KAVTS had a cooperative program in effect. One hundred per cent of the directors and 83.3 per cent of the instructors stated that cooperative training would be carried on in the future.

(6) It was the opinion of 91.7 per cent of vocational agriculture instructors that courses in agricultural chemicals,

fertilizer, grain merchandising, farm machinery repair, farm management, Farm Business Analysis and Young Farmers were needed in their KAVTS on the post-high school level.

(7) According to 66.7 per cent of the directors' responses and 74.5 per cent of the vocational agriculture instructors' responses, the major purposes of vocational agriculture in KAVTS in the future would be job preparation for an occupation, to train for off-farm agricultural occupations, to provide a basis for agricultural professions and to continue to train for farming.

(8) Fifty per cent of the instructors stated that high school vocational agriculture in KAVTS must change to a three hour block and 45.5 per cent of the directors stated that an additional instructor must be added as major changes which must be made in vocational agriculture to meet the basic intent and concept of KAVTS; that of making vocational-technical training in vocational agriculture available on an area basis.

(9) One hundred per cent of directors and vocational agriculture instructors stated that surveys of local, area and state employment needs would be made to determine what areas or courses would be offered in vocational agriculture in KAVTS.

(10) According to 67.2 per cent of the directors' responses and 56.7 per cent of the instructors' responses, the five areas of farm machinery dealers, feed companies, grain elevators, farm supply stores and horticulture programs would best fit the vocational agriculture cooperative training program in KAVTS.

(11) Directors felt that an average of 67.3 per cent and instructors felt that an average of 63.1 per cent of post-high school students completing training in vocational agriculture in KAVTS would be placed in home and surrounding counties.

(12) Opinions of 72.7 per cent of directors and 66.7 per cent of instructors were that additional instructors for specialized areas in vocational agriculture would be obtained from instructors prepared in specialized areas.

(13) It was projected by both directors and vocational agriculture instructors that the number of vocational agriculture instructors in KAVTS would more than double in the next three years.

(14) One hundred per cent of the vocational agriculture instructors and 90.9 per cent of the directors stated that there was a trend in KAVTS toward the divisions of vocational education to lose their identity and merely become a part of the total education program.

(15) It was projected by directors and vocational agriculture instructors that total enrollment in vocational agriculture in KAVTS would increase greater than 70 per cent in the next three years. Projected adult enrollment would more than double and projected post-high school enrollment would increase from twelve to more than two hundred students.

(16) It was the opinion of more than 80 per cent of directors and vocational agriculture instructors that no student organization would be developed for day school post-high school students of vocational agriculture in KAVTS.

IMPLICATIONS

There were several implications which came to the attention of the author during the process of making the study. These implications were not necessarily substantiated by data but were a result of opinions and attitudes of the interviewees and the writer.

The objectives of area vocational-technical education and the objectives of vocational agriculture as it has been taught do not coincide. Directors and vocational agriculture instructors of KAVTS are faced with the task of adapting vocational agriculture into the area vocational-technical concept. On studying the situation, they found that vocational agriculture as it was taught in the past did not neatly fit the requirements of vocational-technical training.

For example, area vocational-technical education was designed to prepare students in specialized areas for gainful employment in an occupation. Vocational agriculture has had a broader scope in the past. It has provided training to prepare students to go into farming, provided a background for a college education and provided basic knowledges and skills for employment in off-farm agricultural occupations.

Area vocational technical training could be accomplished in specialized courses in one or two year programs. Vocational agriculture has been a four year program. It included FFA leadership training, farming programs, farm mechanics skills and technical agriculture instruction. The student grew with the program. Development of attitudes and responsibilities for effective citizenship were of major importance in addition to the vocational training received.

Another concept of area vocational-technical training was to provide vocational technical training on an area basis to those students who did not have this specialized training available in their local communities. Transportation and scheduling of classes were problems, however making students and administrators aware of the availability of this vocational technical instruction and making these transfers into KAVTS were major problems to be overcome.

If students were to receive area vocational technical training and be transported in from area centers, it seemed that this must be done on a Junior-Senior three hour block basis to make the time and transportation worthwhile.

This did not mean that offering a three hour block must be at the expense of the regular vocational agriculture program.

It was the opinion of the writer that a feasible program could be worked out which would retain the best aspects of the present vocational agriculture program, meet the requirements of area vocational technical schools, and serve the needs of the employers and employees.

A feasible high school program would include vocational agriculture grades 9-12. Grades 9 and 10 would be retained to serve students who would normally enroll in vocational agriculture. On the Junior-Senior level, three hour block courses could be offered. Examples were technical agriculture, agriculture and related occupations, specialized training in agricultural mechanics, and a senior cooperative program. This high school vocational agriculture program would serve local needs, would not overlook the student who intended to farm, would provide a student a basis for the agricultural professions and offer an opportunity for specialized job training for gainful employment.

This program could offer specialized training on the post-high school level according to area needs. It was the opinion of the writer that the post-high school day program was where the concept of specialized training and area vocational-technical education best fit in.

Adult farmers, Young Farmers, and Farm Business Analysis classes could fit into the night school. Financing these

programs was the main problem. Multiple teacher departments of vocational agriculture in KAVTS were a must.

Vocational agriculture programs in KAVTS were serving local needs. To assume the opportunity of serving area vocational-technical needs in agriculture seemed to carry with it the added responsibilities of:

- (1) Maintaining the present vocational agriculture program which has been serving local needs.
- (2) Providing an expanded vocational agriculture curriculum at the Junior-Senior level to include and serve students on an area basis.
- (3) Providing day school post-high school specialized vocational-technical training in vocational agriculture for gainful employment.
- (4) Including adult training for Adult Farmers, Young Farmers, and Farm Business Analysis students for the purpose of upgrading and keeping current knowledges and skills.
- (5) Making surveys of employer and employee needs so that training could be geared to the agricultural market in Kansas.
- (6) Adding additional specialized instructors to the staff so more technical training could be accomplished.

(7) Providing sufficient facilities and renting up-to-date equipment to keep abreast of the changing needs in agriculture.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Agan, Ray. A Study of Non-Farm Agricultural Occupations in Kansas. A study made in cooperation between the Kansas State Board for Vocational Education and the School of Education. Kansas State University (1964).
- Arnold, Walter M. "New Directions in Vocational Education," American Vocational Journal, XXXIX (October, 1964).
- Bradley, Howard R. "Agriculture in Kansas Area Vocational Schools." The Agricultural Education Magazine, XXXVII (April, 1965).
- Hamilton, Vance Eugene. "Patterns of Responsibility in Multi-Teacher Departments," Summaries of Studies in Agricultural Education. North Carolina State College, Raleigh, North Carolina (1961, No. 15).
- Kaiser, Denver J. "How to Make a Multiple Teacher Program Work," The Agricultural Education Magazine, XXXI (July, 1958).
- Lacey, John. "Vocational Education for a Changing World of Work," Kansas 4-H Journal, LXVIII (February, 1965).
- McCormick, Thaine D. "Learning that Makes Careers," The Kansas Farmer-Stockman, LXVIII (February, 1965).
- McCune, Duane. "A Study of the Need for an Area Vocational-Technical School in the Dickinson County Community High School District." Unpublished Master's Report, Kansas State University, Manhattan (1964).
- Senate Bill No. 438. Legislature of the State of Kansas, enacted July 1, 1963.
- Smith, Clodus, R. "Manpower Development Training Program: Challenge to Agriculture," American Vocational Journal, XXXIX (October, 1964).

State Department of Public Instruction. Kansas Educational Directory, 1964-65, Bulletin 340. Issued by Adel F. Throckmorton, State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Summary of Offerings and Enrollments in High School Subjects, 1960-61. Washington: Government Printing Office.

APPENDIXES

MEMORANDUM
State Board for Vocational Education

March 9, 1965

TO: Vocational Agriculture Teachers in Area
Schools

FROM: John W. Lacey

SUBJECT: Research Project

Mr. Al Mannebach, the vocational agriculture teacher at Wilson, Kansas, is doing a master's report on the general subject of how to fit agriculture education into the administrative and physical structure of the area vocational-technical schools in Kansas. I would urge that you give him your fullest cooperation when he calls for a personal interview. We are all interested in this problem, and it is possible that Mr. Mannebach may provide some solution for us.

Box 71
Wilson, Kansas
March 5, 1965

Mr. W. F. Currier, Director
Southeast Kansas AVTS
Coffeyville, Kansas

Dear Mr. Currier:

I am presently working on my master's report entitled, "Selected Characteristics of and Projections for Vocational Agriculture in Kansas Area Vocational-Technical Schools."

I would like to come to your school on Monday, March 15, in the morning for a personal interview with you on "Projections for." I would also like to interview your vocational agriculture instructor on both "Characteristics of and Projections for."

If this date is not satisfactory, could you please suggest a date which I could possibly get together with both you and your vocational agriculture instructor?

Thank you for your prompt reply and for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Alfred J. Mannebach
Vo-Ag Instructor

APPENDIX B

Name _____ Title _____

(Name of School) (Date)

FORM I

Selected Characteristics of Vocational Agriculture in KAVTS
Vocational Agriculture Teachers Form

Part I - General Information

A. Enrollments

1. How many students of vocational agriculture are enrolled from each of the following?

_____ Number of high school students from the area previously served by the high school district

_____ Number of high school students served on an area basis

_____ Number of post-high school students from the area previously served by the local high school district

_____ Number of post-high school students served on an area basis

_____ Number of Adult Farmer, Young Farmer, and Farm Business Analysis Students

2. What is the number of farm boys enrolled in high school vocational agriculture? _____
3. What is the number of non-farm boys enrolled in high school vocational agriculture? _____

4. What courses are a part of the total vocational agriculture curriculum?

Grade	Number of Hours Class Time Per Day	Number of Students	Number of High School Credits
___ 9	___	___	___
___ 10	___	___	___
___ 11	___	___	___
___ 12	___	___	___
___ Cooperative Program	___	___	___
___ Young Farmers	___	___	___
___ Adult Farmers	___	___	___
___ Farm Business Analysis	___	___	___
Other (Specify)			
___	___	___	___
___	___	___	___

B. Vocational Agriculture Staff

1. How many teachers are presently teaching vocational agriculture?

Number ___ Number Full Time ___ Number Part Time ___

2. How many years teaching experience have you had in vocational agriculture? ___

3. Do you have a masters degree? Yes ___ No ___

4. Are temporary teachers or specialists employed for special lessons? Yes ___ No ___

5. Is one teacher designated as department head? Yes ___ No ___

6. Who determines how the teaching load will be divided?

___ Head Teacher ___ Director and Both
 Teachers Cooperatively
 ___ Both Teachers Cooperatively ___ Other
 ___ Director

7. How is supervision of farming programs or work experience carried on? (Check those that apply)

___ Teacher supervises only those students taught in his vocational agriculture classes
 ___ Teacher supervises students taught in his vocational agriculture classes and all vocational agriculture students periodically
 ___ Teacher supervises students within his specialized area
 ___ No definite schedule for supervision has been set up

C. Facilities

1. How many classrooms are available for vocational agriculture?

2. What is the size of the classrooms? _____

3. What is the size of the agricultural mechanics shop?

4. a. Do you have a laboratory? Yes ___ No ___ Planned ___

b. Do you have a separate office? Yes ___ No ___ Planned ___

c. Do you have a greenhouse? Yes ___ No ___ Planned ___

d. Do you have a school farm? Yes ___ No ___ Planned ___

5. What new facilities have been added to the vocational agriculture department since becoming a part of the area vocational-technical school?

Classroom Facilities

Shop Facilities

PART II - CURRICULUM

A. High School Curriculum

TECHNICAL AGRICULTURE

1. What changes have been made in the day school technical agriculture curriculum since becoming part of the area vocational- technical school?

Areas Added

Areas Dropped

2. Approximately what per cent of the time spent teaching technical agriculture is devoted to teaching about or for the following?

____ % Production

____ % Agribusiness

____ % Leadership

Other

____ % Marketing

____ %

____ % Services

____ %

3. Concerning off-farm agricultural occupations in vocational agriculture do you teach primarily?

____ About specific off-farm agricultural occupations and opportunities

____ About clusters of off-farm agricultural occupations

____ For specific off-farm agricultural occupations

___ For clusters of off-farm agricultural occupations

___ None of the above

4. What are the main specific off-farm occupations and clusters of off-farm occupations which you teach about?

Specific

Clusters

5. What are the main specific off-farm occupations and clusters of off-farm occupations which you teach for?

Specific

Clusters

AGRICULTURAL MECHANICS

1. What changes have been made in the high school agricultural mechanics curriculum since becoming a part of the area vocational-technical school?

Areas Added

Areas Dropped

2. What per cent of time spent in teaching agricultural mechanics is devoted to the following?

___ Developing knowledges and skills for use on the farm

___ Developing knowledges and skills for off-farm agricultural occupations

___ Developing knowledges and skills for off-farm occupations

Other

FARMING PROGRAMS

1. How important do you feel that supervised practice or on farm instruction is in vocational agriculture in the area vocational-technical school?

☐ Very important
☐ More than average importance
☐ Average importance
☐ Less than average importance
☐ Little importance

2. How many times per year is on farm instruction or supervised practice given to students?

☐ 0 - 2 times
☐ 3 - 4 times
☐ 5 - 6 times
☐ 7 - or more times

3. To what extent are class field trips taken to farms to study production methods, approved practices and learn skills?

Field Trips Per Year

☐ 0 - 10
☐ 11 - 20
☐ 21 - 30
☐ 31 - 40
☐ 41 - or more

4. What would best describe emphasis given farming programs in relation to the rest of the vocational agriculture program since becoming a part of the area vocational-technical school?

☐ Emphasis has increased
☐ Emphasis has decreased
☐ Emphasis has remained about the same

COOPERATIVE PROGRAM

1. Is an agricultural business placement, work experience, on-farm placement, or earning-learning program cooperatively in effect for high school students enrolled in vocational agriculture in the area vocational-technical school?

Yes ☐ No ☐ Explain:

2. In what areas is the cooperative program carried out?

3. To what grades is this program offered?

☐ Grade 9 ☐ Grade 11
☐ Grade 10 ☐ Grade 12

4. Who helps the student decide on his area of work or study?

☐ Vocational Agriculture Instructor
☐ Area Vocational-Technical School Guidance Personnel
☐ High School Guidance Personnel
☐ Parents ☐ Employer

5. How much time does the student spend with the employer on the job?

_____ Number of hours per day

_____ Number of hours per week

_____ Number of hours per year

6. Which of the following would best describe the depth of training the students receive?

_____ Student gets job orientation

_____ Student does odd jobs and gets first hand observation

_____ Student helps perform major jobs

_____ Student is responsible for a major part of the job

_____ Student develops job proficiency and is ready for placement

7. Does the student receive payment for his work?

Yes_____ No_____ Comments:

8. Who is responsible for planning the cooperative program?

_____ Vocational Agriculture Teacher

_____ Business Education Teacher

_____ Employer

_____ Director

_____ Both Cooperatively

_____ Coordinator

9. Who is responsible for supervision and rating of students' cooperative experience?

<input type="checkbox"/> Vocational Agriculture Teacher	<input type="checkbox"/> Coordinator
<input type="checkbox"/> Employer	<input type="checkbox"/> Other
<input type="checkbox"/> Director	<input type="checkbox"/>

10. Is there a written agreement among the student, school, and employer?

Yes ☐ No ☐ Comments:

11. How do students obtain placement in the cooperative program?

☐ Student obtains his own placement

☐ Vocational Agriculture Teacher obtains placement for students

☐ Placement service is obtained from area Vocational-Technical School

☐ Other

12. Are class field trips taken to different business establishments?

☐ To learn about non-farm occupations and opportunities

☐ To learn skills

☐ To gain knowledge of operation

☐ All above

☐ No field trips are taken

13. What is the cooperative program designed to do?

☐ Provide work experience

☐ Provide knowledge of an occupation

☐ Provide an earning-learning situation

☐ Provide knowledges and skills for placement in an occupation

Other

☐

FUTURE FARMERS OF AMERICA

1. What have been the major changes in FFA activities and participation since becoming a part of the area vocational-technical school?

2. How many students served outside the local high school district participate in FFA activities? _____

3. What would best describe the emphasis given FFA in relation to the rest of the vocational agriculture program since becoming a part of the area vocational-technical school?

☐ Emphasis has increased

☐ Emphasis has decreased

☐ Emphasis has remained about the same

4. Who is responsible for advising the FFA Chapter?

Head Teacher ☐ One Teacher ☐ Both Teachers ☐

B. Post-High School Curriculum

1. What agriculture courses are now offered to post-high school students in the area vocational-technical school?
2. On what basis were the courses now offered developed?
☐ By a survey of area needs
☐ By a survey of state needs
☐ By a request of the students
☐ By request of employers
☐ Because of the qualifications of the teacher
Other _____

3. Is there an organization at the post-high school level for students enrolled in agriculture courses? (Answer only if in a multiple teacher department)
Yes_____ No_____
Name of organization_____
4. Who is responsible for teaching post-high school agriculture courses?
Head Teacher_____ One Teacher_____ Both Teachers_____

5. Following are listed several selected occupational areas in agriculture which could be developed into agriculture courses:

- a. Check Column I if you think there is a need for this course on the post-high school level in your area vocational-technical school.
- b. Check Column II if you feel you are capable of teaching this course on the post-high school level.
- c. Check Column III if you feel you would need additional training to be able to teach this course.
- d. Check Column IV if you feel the course has no place in vocational agriculture in your area vocational-technical school.

	Column I	Column II	Column III	Column IV
Farm Machinery Repair	_____	_____	_____	_____
Farm Power	_____	_____	_____	_____
Diesel Mechanics	_____	_____	_____	_____
L. P. Power Units	_____	_____	_____	_____
Hydraulics	_____	_____	_____	_____
Irrigation Equipment	_____	_____	_____	_____
Farm Shopwork	_____	_____	_____	_____
Rural Electrification	_____	_____	_____	_____
Farm Buildings and Conveniences	_____	_____	_____	_____
Soil and Water Manage- ment	_____	_____	_____	_____

Rural Recreation	—	—	—	—
Horticulture	—	—	—	—
Floriculture	—	—	—	—
Landscaping	—	—	—	—
Fertilizer	—	—	—	—
Agricultural Chemicals	—	—	—	—
Grain Merchandising	—	—	—	—
Feed Mill Operations	—	—	—	—
Feeds and Feeding	—	—	—	—
Meat Cutting and Processing	—	—	—	—
Agricultural Sales- manship	—	—	—	—
Farm Management	—	—	—	—
Farm Business Analysis	—	—	—	—
Young Farmers	—	—	—	—
Adult Farmers	—	—	—	—

APPENDIX C

Name _____ Date _____

(Name of School) (Title)

FORM II

Projections for Vocational Agriculture in KAVTS
Directors and Vocational Agriculture Teachers Form

1. What will be the main purposes of vocational agriculture in Kansas Area Vocational-Technical Schools?
2. What changes must be made in your present vocational agriculture program to meet the basic intent and concept of the area vocational-technical school?
3. What new areas will become a part of the post-high school vocational agriculture curriculum?
4. How will you determine what areas or courses will be taught?
5. At what level will high school dropouts fit into the vocational agriculture curriculum?
____ High School Curriculum
____ Post-High School Curriculum

6. What provisions will be made for training the academically handicapped student?
7. At what level will cooperative training be carried on?
- ☐ High School Curriculum
 - ☐ Post-High School Curriculum
 - ☐ Both High School and Post-High School Curriculum
 - ☐ Will not be carried on
8. What areas do you feel will best fit the vocational agriculture cooperative program?
9. Is the trend for vocational agriculture for high school students away from the broad basic coverage of knowledges and skills and toward specialization? Yes___ No___
10. Will specialization in vocational agriculture in the area vocational-technical school be to the extent that a student will be prepared to enter a specific agricultural occupation upon graduation from high school? Yes___ No___
11. What are the main advantages of the vocational agriculture program being a part of the area vocational-technical school?
12. What are the chief disadvantages of the vocational agriculture program being a part of the area vocational-technical school?

13. Will guidance personnel be employed by the area vocational-technical school to help students evaluate their interests, aptitudes, and abilities in selecting an area of study?

Yes___ No___

14. Will placement services be provided for vocational agriculture students by the area vocational-technical school?

Yes___ No___

15. What per cent of post-high school students completing training in the area vocational-technical school in vocational agriculture do you feel will be placed in each of the following?

___ Home and surrounding counties

___ Kansas

___ Out of state

16. Where will qualified instructors for specialized areas be obtained?

___ From competent men in specialized areas

___ From vocational agriculture instructors prepared in specialized areas

___ Depends on the specialization of the courses offered

Other

17. Will the vocational agriculture instructor in the area vocational-technical school become more and more a specialist in a particular subject matter field? Yes___ No___

18. In your opinion, how many vocational agriculture instructors will be teaching in this area vocational-technical school center three years from now? _____

19. Is there a trend in the area vocational-technical school toward the divisions of vocational education to lose their identity and merely become part of the total vocational education program? Yes___ No___ Comments:
20. Will adult and post-high school enrollment increase in the vocational agriculture curriculum in the area vocational-technical school? Yes___ No___
21. Is there a need for a vocational agriculture instructor to be employed full time to instruct young farmers, adult farmers, and farm business analysis classes?
Yes___ No___ Part Time___
22. In what areas will you provide agricultural education for young and adult farmers?
23. What is the projected enrollment in vocational agriculture three years from now?
___ In the high school program
___ In the post-high school program
___ In adult, young farmer, and farm business analysis program
24. What has been school, community, and student reaction to vocational agriculture in the area vocational-technical school thus far?

25. Will an advisory council be set up to help coordinate vocational agriculture activities? Yes___ No___
26. How will the vocational agriculture program in the area vocational-technical school affect the FFA organization?
27. What role will student organization on the post-high school level play?

SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF AND PROJECTIONS FOR
VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE IN KANSAS AREA
VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL SCHOOLS

by

ALFRED J. MANNEBACH

B. S., KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY, 1963

AN ABSTRACT OF A MASTER'S REPORT

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements of the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Agricultural Education

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

Manhattan, Kansas

1965

SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF AND PROJECTIONS FOR
VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE IN KANSAS AREA
VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL SCHOOLS

The central purposes of this study was to determine selected characteristics of and projections for vocational agriculture in KAVTS. It was a further purpose to compile selected basic information which could be used as guidelines in the future establishment and maintenance of vocational agriculture in KAVTS.

Twelve vocational agriculture departments in seven KAVTS were involved in the study. Data were obtained by use of an interview checklist-questionnaire developed with the aid of an informal panel of consultants.

The interview checklist-questionnaire was divided into two parts, Form I and Form II. Twelve vocational agriculture instructors were interviewed about the selected characteristics of vocational agriculture in KAVTS in Form I. These twelve instructors along with eleven directors and assistant directors of KAVTS responded to Form II dealing with projections for vocational agriculture in KAVTS. A 100 per cent response was obtained.

A simple analysis of data compiled from completed survey forms indicated a variation of judgments and opinions.

The following conclusions were considered as basic findings of the study:

(1) Of a total of 740 students in KAVTS, eleven or 1.5 per cent represented high school students served on an area basis. This number represented 2.3 per cent of the total high school vocational agriculture enrollment.

(2) All twelve or 100 per cent of post-high school students enrolled in day school vocational agriculture in KAVTS were served on an area basis.

(3) One vocational agriculture department in KAVTS had a cooperative program in effect. One hundred per cent of the directors and 83.3 per cent of the instructors stated that cooperative training would be carried on in the future.

(4) According to 66.7 per cent of the directors' responses and 74.5 per cent of the vocational agriculture instructors' responses, the major purposes of vocational agriculture in KAVTS in the future would be job preparation for an occupation, to train for off-farm agricultural occupations, to provide a basis for agricultural professions and to continue to train for farming.

(5) One hundred per cent of directors and vocational agriculture instructors stated that surveys of local, area and state employment needs would be made to determine what areas or courses would be offered in vocational agriculture in KAVTS.

(6) Directors felt that an average of 67.3 per cent and instructors felt that an average of 83.1 per cent of post-high school students completing training in vocational agriculture in KAVTS would be placed in home and surrounding counties.

(7) It was projected by both directors and vocational agriculture instructors that the number of vocational agriculture instructors in KAVTS would more than double in the next three years.

(8) It was projected by directors and vocational agriculture instructors that total enrollment in vocational agriculture in KAVTS would increase greater than 70 per cent in the next three years. Projected adult enrollment would more than double and projected post-high school enrollment would increase from twelve to more than two hundred students.